

The reader may wish to use last year's Federal Programs issue to look back 1 year to review what happened to these programs in 1996. In that, our very first Federal Programs issue, we provided more detail about the purpose and activities of core development programs. We also covered a broader array of programs, including agriculture, defense, income support, health, education and training, and natural resources and environment programs. The miscellaneous programs article in that issue covered social services, trade, and Native American programs.

Another reason for referring to last year's Federal Programs issue is that it has maps and tables that provide useful information about individual programs. In this year's issue, we have deliberately avoided duplicating maps shown in the previous year, because most funding patterns do not change that much from year to year. By referring to maps and figures from this year's and last year's issues together, a more complete picture is revealed about the distribution of development funding in rural America.

A list of the contents of the 1996 Federal Programs *RCaT*, together with the figures and tables, is provided to aid the reader in identifying articles and figures of interest.

Contents of *Rural Conditions and Trends*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 1996

Overview

1996 Has Been a Year of Federal Program Reductions, Disruptions, and Reforms

General Development Assistance

General Assistance Aids Comprehensive Development Strategies

Figure 1: Counties receiving general development assistance from three EDA programs, 1994 (map)

Figure 2: Per capita funding from the State/small cities program in 1994 (map)

Figure 3: State/small cities program funding per nonmetro person in 1994 (map)—See ERRATA at the end of this appendix

Infrastructure Assistance

Some Infrastructure Programs Cut

Figure 1: Per capita grants for Airport Improvement Program, 1994 (chart)

Figure 2: USDA rural infrastructure programs, 1994 (map)

Business Assistance

Federal Business Assistance Declines Modestly

Figure 1: Per capita Federal nonmetro business assistance, 1994 (map)

Figure 2: Per capita business assistance by county type, 1994 (chart)

Box: List of Federal Business Assistance programs

Housing Assistance

Federal Assistance for Rural Housing Shifts Toward Loan Guarantees

Figure 1: Federal agencies and home mortgage lending, 1993 (chart)

Figure 2: Per capita USDA nonmetro single-family housing loans, 1994 (map)

Figure 3: Per capita funding for nonmetro public housing, 1994 (map)

Natural Resources and Environment

Natural Resource and Environmental Programs Undergo Historic Changes

Figure 1: Federal budget authority, natural resources and environment, 1996 (chart)

Figure 2: Federal outlays for grants to State and local governments, natural resources and environment programs (chart)

Figure 3: Federal outlays for grants to State and local governments, natural resources programs, 1994 (chart)

Figure 4: Federal grants to States for natural resource programs, dollars per capita, 1994 (map)

Figure 5: Environmental Protection Agency funding set at \$6.5 billion for 1996 (chart)

Figure 6: Environmental protection per capita, 1994 (map)

Education and Training

Uncertainties in Federal Funding Situation Cause Problems for Rural Education and Training Programs

Figure 1: Nonmetro title I spending per student, 1994 (map)

Figure 2: Nonmetro impact aid spending per student, 1994 (map)

Figure 3: Federal spending for training and employment programs, 1965-95 (chart)

Figure 4: Federal spending for Job Corps, 1975-95 (chart)

Health

Proposals to Slow Growth of Federal Health Spending Focus on Medicare and Medicaid

Figure 1: Growth of Federal health spending, 1990-95 (chart)

Figure 2: Nonmetro counties with a high proportion of Medicare beneficiaries, 1991 (map)

Figure 3: Regional variations in Medicaid coverage of the nonmetro poor, 1993 (map)

Table 1: Medicare Program: How Characteristics differ, Metro vs Nonmetro

Table 2: Medicaid Program: How Characteristics differ, Metro vs Nonmetro

Income Support

Income and Nutrition Support Programs Are Important Resources for Rural Communities

Figure 1: Percent of rural population groups in households receiving selected program benefits, 1993 (chart)

Figure 2: Per capita Social Security payments, 1994 (map)

Figure 3: Food stamps, 1994, and poverty levels, 1989 (map)

Table 1: Summary of largest income support and nutrition programs

Defense

Funding Continues to Drop in Defense Programs

Figure 1: Active duty, National Guard, and reserves in the 50 States, 1993 (map)

Figure 2: Defense investment in basic and applied scientific research, 1994 (map)

Table 1: Nonmetro counties receiving military base reuse assistance (list with amounts)

Table 2: Nonmetro counties receiving community planning assistance for defense industry adjustments (list with amounts)

Agriculture

1996 Agricultural Legislation Cuts Link Between Income Support Payments and Farm Prices

Figure 1: Direct government payments to farmers in nonmetro counties, 1994 (map)

Figure 2: Projected direct farm payments (chart)

Figure 3: Direct government payments, by sales class, 1994 (chart)

Figure 4: Conservation Reserve Program payments in nonmetro counties, 1994 (map)

Figure 5: Post-contract availability of Conservation Reserve Program land, 1994 (chart)

Miscellaneous Programs

Social Services, Trade, and Native American Programs Have Sustained Budget Cuts

Figure 1: Social service program funding, per capita, 1994 (chart)

Tax Policy

Federal Tax Developments Limited to the Earned Income Tax Credit

Figure 1: Per capita earned income tax credit benefits by type of State, 1994 (chart)

Regulatory Policy

Some Regulatory Changes Underway; Others Still to Be Enacted

Figure 1: New maximum daytime speed limits, by State, as of May 7, 1996 (map)

Figure 2: Nonmetro counties with one or more federally recognized Indian Tribes and their gaming status, as of December 1995 (map)

Appendix A

Data Sources and Definitions

Figure 1: Urban-rural typology, 1993 (map)

Figure 2: Farming States, 1991-93 (map)

Figure 3: Retirement States, 1980-90 (map)

Figure 4: Poverty States, 1960-90 (map)

Figure 5: Federal lands States, 1987 (map)

Appendix B

Funding Levels for Selected Programs

Appendix Table 1: Budget Changes for selected programs, fiscal years 1995 to 1996

ERRATA

In our 1996 *RCaT* article on General Development Assistance, the map (fig. 3) showing State funding amounts per nonmetro person for the State/Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, and the text associated with this program, were misleading. Our underlying assumption in making this map was that the State/Small Cities program provided funding mainly to nonmetropolitan areas, hence dividing funding by nonmetro population would show the degree of assistance given to nonmetro areas within each State. This was an incorrect assumption.

According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which administers these programs, significant portions of metropolitan areas, including metro places that are not a part of large urban cities or heavily populated urban counties, receive their CDBG assistance through the State/Small Cities program. In 1994, about 102 million people were eligible for this program, almost double the 53 million nonmetro population. In some States, such as in the Northeast (New Jersey, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland), the Midwest (Ohio, Indiana, Michigan), the South (South Carolina, Louisiana, Florida, and Texas), and the West (California), the eligible metro population for these programs exceeds the nonmetro population by ratios greater than 2:1.

Thus, while most of the grantees of these programs may still be considered rural, our map overstated the extent that nonmetro populations benefited from the program and was misleading in suggesting that nonmetro residents in the Northeast and Midwest benefited disproportionately.

HUD also noted that the per capita State amounts shown in fig. 2 were in some cases less than the funds allocated to these States. This discrepancy may reflect the different accounting bases used by Census (the data we used in the maps) and HUD's data on funding allocations. Nevertheless, the overall geographic pattern we showed in fig. 2, should still hold, indicating that rural States tend to benefit more than other States from this program.